

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 25, 2003, claims 4-7, 11-13, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Additionally, claim 11 was objected to because of an informality. In the present Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 4, 11, and 19 and respectfully submit that the aforementioned claims do not suffer from any informalities or deficiencies under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have not amended claims 7 and 22 and respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection to these two claims. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no confusion in regards to the term "web" as this term was sufficiently defined on page 6, lines 1-9 of the specification. In this regard, Applicants have defined the term "web" to include materials such as cording and rope.

Also, in the Office Action of September 25, 2003, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, 16, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,034,928).

Additionally, claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald in view of Ball (U.S. Patent No. 5,310,056).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over McDonald. Respectfully, McDonald does not disclose a rolled web product that has a continuous web wrapped around a core. Support for this claim amendment may be found in at least Figs. 1 and 8 of the drawings which shows the web 21/121 being a continuous web that forms the roll 27/120.

McDonald does not disclose a rolled web product at set forth in claim 1.

McDonald is directed towards an apparatus and process for producing a roll of separable folded sheets or bags (see McDonald at column 2, lines 10-12, lines 17-20, lines 38-40, and lines 46-50). The sheets or bags 40 in McDonald are therefore separate items that are interleaved with one another and wound in order to form the roll.

As shown in Fig. 3 of McDonald, a folded end of a succeeding bag 40' is inserted between the tailing end portions of a leading bag 40 (see McDonald at column 7, lines 13-16). The bags 40 and 40' are therefore separate components that are interfolded with one another and wound in order to form the roll assembly. The sheets or bags 40 of McDonald are not continuous when forming the roll assembly, but as stated are separate objects.

In fact, McDonald specifically teaches against having sheets or bags that are continuous with one another in forming the roll assembly. In this regard, McDonald states that rolled web products which are formed by a continuous web are disfavored because these types of rolled web products are usually large and cumbersome to handle (see McDonald at column 1, lines 43-47). As such, McDonald does not disclose a rolled web product that has a continuous web wrapped around a core, and in fact specifically teaches against such a configuration.

As used by the Applicants, the word "continuous" web is broad enough to include webs that have perforations disposed therethrough in order to separate different sheets, napkins, bags, towels, etc. from the roll. Additionally, a continuous web as used by the Applicants also covers a rolled web product that does not have perforations.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over McDonald and

is in condition for allowance. Further, all claims which depend from claim 1 (claims 2-7, 14, and 15) are also in condition for allowance. Their rejections being made moot due to the allowance of claim 1.

In the present Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 8 and 16 along the same lines as the amendment made to claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 16 define over McDonald for essentially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and are in condition for allowance. Further, all claims which depend from claims 8 and 16 (claims 9-13 and 17-22) are also in condition for allowance. Their rejections being made moot due to the allowance of claims 8 and 16.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at his convenience to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

Neal P. Pierotti

December 5, 2003
Date

Neal P. Pierotti
Reg. No. 45,716
P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
(864) 271-1592
FAX (864) 233-7342